REMARKS

These remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed February 7, 2006. In that Office Action, claims 12-14 were examined, and all claims were rejected. More specifically, claims 12-14 have been provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting; and claims 12-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitner et al. (USPN 6,470,375), hereinafter "Whitner," in view of Bakshi et al. (USPN 6,574,663), hereinafter "Bakshi." Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the following amendments and remarks.

In this response, claim 13 was amended to correct a clerical error. New claims 19-35 have been added. Therefore, claims 12-13 and 19-35 are present for examination.

Double Patenting

Claims 12-14 have been provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting. Submitted herewith is a terminal disclaimer, which renders the double patenting rejection moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 12-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitner in view of Bakshi. Applicants respectfully traverse the section 103 rejections for all claims. The Examiner has failed to prove a prima facie case of obviousness because one or more of the requirements of a prima facie case are absent. Indeed, a prima facie case can only be met when **all** of the following requirements are met: (1) the combined references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations; (2) there must be some suggestion or motivation in the references themselves (or in the knowledge available to those skilled in the art) to combine the references; and (3) there must be a reasonable expectation of success. See MPEP §§ 706.02(j)

and 2143. Indeed, Whitner in view of Bakshi do not teach all the claim limitations. Most notably, Whitner and Bakshi, either alone or in combination, fail to teach <u>storing the first portion of the search information in a first manager data store</u> and <u>storing the second portion of the search information in a second manager data store</u>.

The management system, as defined by the claims of the present invention, relates to a scalable management framework that manages a plurality of back-end resources in a uniform manner. See page 5, lines 5-7. In embodiments, the management system provides two or more managers. See page 18, lines 5-7. The managers each store information into a manager-related data store. See page 18, lines 7-9. When a new resource is installed, a notification, which includes search information in some embodiments, is received. See page 21, lines 4-15. The search information is retrieved and each manager determines if a portion of the search information relates to that manager. See page 21, line 23 – page 22, line 9 and page 23, lines 2-15. If a portion of the search information does relate to that manager, the manager stores that portion of the search information in the manager's related data store. See page 23, lines 16-22. This information may then be used at a later time to interact with the new resource. See page 25, lines 17-19.

Whitner, while the reference describes two or more managers, does not describe or teach data stores related to the managers or storing search information related to the managers in the related data stores. Whitner teaches a task manager that includes several sub-managers. See col. 6, lines 53-58 ("The task manager 10 includes a single management application program interface (API) 28 that interfaces with the sub-managers of task manager 10. The sub-managers of task manager 10 include a command task manager 30, a function task manager 32, and a remote task execution manager 34."). Further, Whitner provides a *single data store*, which

stores all task information regardless to which manager the information relates, that is accessed

by a task registration manager. See col. 6, lines 58-63 ("Task registration is performed by a task

registration manager 36 which includes a task registration database (now shown). An abstract

data access facility API 38 is provided for enabling the task manager 10 to interface with a data

access facility (not shown) in order to access and interact with data objects associated with a

task.") and Fig. 1, element 36 (showing a single task registration manager).

Whitner does not separately store information in separate data stores related to the

different managers. See col. 9, lines 25-28 ("The task descriptions for all products using the task

manager 10 are registered in a central location within task registration manager 36."). Indeed,

the task manager in Whitner relies on this single data access facility rather than several different

data stores. See col. 10, lines 6-9 ("The task manager 10 is configured to so rely on the data

access facility so that it can be easily modified to support the many difference forms of object

oriented data structures used in the industry."). Reliance on several different data stores would

defeat the stated objectives of Whitner.

The management system, as defined in the claims of the present invention, uses several

manger-related data stores. The manager-related data stores allow the managers to individually

interact with resources. This configuration provides added scalability and flexibility over

Whitner. As Whitner does not include manager-related data stores, Whitner cannot and does not

describe storing the first portion of the search information in a first manager data store and

storing the second portion of the search information in a second manager data store.

Bakshi does not overcome the lack of description in Whitner. Bakshi describes managing

devices in a network using only two databases. See col. 1, lines 49-50 ("The present disclosure

provides methods for operating a network by using two different databases."). The two

databases relate to device topology and device characteristics. See col. 1, lines 50-59 ("A first database has information about topology of devices connected in the network. The second database has information about at least topology, software and hardware configurations of selected devices that have predetermined device attributes. The information in the first and second databases is combined to choose a suitable selected device to perform a function when the function is installed, or to install the function in the suitable selected device when the function is not installed in the network.").

The databases in Bakshi are not similar to manager-related data stores. The databases in Bakshi store device-related data. See col. 2, lines 35-42 ("Certain networking operations may involve only a certain type of devices having one or more desired attributes in the network without other types of devices. The information on that desired attribute of the certain type of devices, and its relation to the topology of the entire network, may become relevant or even critical in order to efficiently perform those certain networking operations."). At most, the databases described in Bakshi are somewhat similar to the resource data stores (see application, Fig. 3, element 323 and page 16, lines 6-17). However, resource data stores are not the same as manager-related data stores. Thus, Bakshi cannot and does not describe storing the first portion of the search information in a first manager data store and storing the second portion of the search information in a second manager data store.

For the forgoing reasons, Whitner and Bakshi, either alone or in combination, do not teach all the limitations of claims 12, 13, and 14 and, therefore, cannot anticipate the present invention as claimed. Claims 12, 13, and 14 are allowable over the prior art of record and should be allowed. All other claims, i.e., claims 19-35 depend from the allowable independent claims

and are, thus, also allowable over the prior art of record. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner issue a notice of allowance, for all claims, at his earliest convenience.

Conclusion

This Amendment fully responds to the Office Action mailed on February 7, 2006. Still, that Office Action may contain arguments and rejections and that are not directly addressed by this Amendment due to the fact that they are rendered moot in light of the preceding arguments in favor of patentability. Hence, failure of this Amendment to directly address an argument raised in the Office Action should not be taken as an indication that the Applicants believe the argument has merit. Furthermore, the claims of the present application may include other elements, not discussed in this Amendment, which are not shown, taught, or otherwise suggested by the art of record. Accordingly, the preceding arguments in favor of patentability are advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability.

It is believed that no further fees are due with this Response. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment with respect to this patent application to deposit account number 13-2725.

In light of the above remarks and amendments, it is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any additional issues need to be resolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attempt to resolve those issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 5, 2004

```
27488
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE
```

Tadd F. Wilson, Reg. No. 54,544
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
303.357.1651